REMARKS

Claims 3, 8-10, 16, 20 and 24-43 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 11-15, 17-19, and 21-23 have been amended. New claims 44-55 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 11-15, 17-19, 21-23 and 44-55 are pending in the case.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 11-15, 17-19, and 21-23 are Allowable

Claims 1-23 were rejected, at paragraph 1 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 3, 8-10, 16 and 20 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering the rejections of these claims moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the remaining rejections.

The Office Action asserts that "The claimed subject matter can be implemented and entirely contained within a processor." *Office Action*, paragraph 1. Contrary to this assertion, claim 1 recites a first memory, a second memory and a processor, which are hardware devices. Thus, claim 1 is directed to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable, as are claims 2, 4-7, and 11-13, which depend from claim 1.

Claim 14 is directed to a method of implementing a telecommunication protocol. Claim 14 recites "storing updated first template state data in a second memory." Storing updated first template state data is a useful, tangible and concrete result. Thus, claim 14 is directed to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, claim 14 is allowable, as are claims 15, 17-19, and 21-23, which depend from claim 14.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 11-15, 18 and 19 are Allowable

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 11-15, 18 and 19 were rejected, at paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0252703 ("Bullman"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The cited portions of Bullman fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of elements of claim 1. For example, the Office Action admits that Bullman does not disclose a

finite state machine. *Office Action*, p.4. The Office Action maintains that U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0161907 ("Moon") discloses a finite state machine. The cited portions of Moon disclose a finite state machine that is dedicated to convert an incoming binary stream into a specific application protocol bit stream into a multi-dimensional matrix representation of a particular communication protocol. *Moon*, Abstract. The cited portions of Moon do not disclose initializing a finite state machine using first template state data, as in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the cited portions of Bullman and Moon. Additionally, claims 2, 5, 6 and 11-13, which depend from claim 1, are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

The dependent claims recite additional elements that are not taught or suggest by the cited portions of Bullman and Moon. For example, the cited portions of Bullman and Moon do not disclose that a second memory does not store an entire set of virtual machine instructions from a first telecommunication protocol template at a single time, as in claim 46. Hence, claim 46 is allowable for at least this additional reason.

The cited portions of Bullman fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of elements of claim 14. For example, the Office Action admits that Bullman does not disclose a finite state machine. *Office Action*, p. 4. The Office Action maintains that Moon discloses a finite state machine. The cited portions of Moon disclose a finite state machine that is dedicated to convert an incoming binary stream into a specific application protocol bit stream into a multi-dimensional matrix representation of a particular communication protocol. *Moon*, Abstract. The cited portions of Moon do not disclose initializing a first finite state machine defined by a first telecommunication protocol template using first template state data to arrive at a first template state, as in claim 14.

Accordingly, claim 14 is allowable over the cited portions of Bullman and Moon. Additionally, claims 15, 18 and 19, which depend from claim 14, are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 14.

The dependent claims recite additional elements that are not taught or suggested by the cited portions of Bullman and Moon. For example, the cited portions of Bullman and Moon do

not disclose causing a virtual machine to read a subsequent first virtual machine instruction of a first telecommunication protocol template from a first memory based on updated first template state data and a first finite state machine, as in claim 52. Hence, claim 52 is allowable for at least this additional reason. In another example, the cited portions of Bullman and Moon do not disclose that no more than one virtual machine instruction to implement the first telecommunication protocol is stored in the second memory at any time, as in claim 53. Hence, claim 53 is allowable for at least this additional reason. In still another example, the cited portions of Bullman and Moon do not disclose that the first virtual machine instruction and a second virtual machine instruction are not stored in the second memory concurrently, as in claim 55. Hence, claim 55 is allowable for at least this additional reason.

Claims 4, 7, 17, and 21-23 are Allowable

Claims 3, 4, 7-10, 16, 17, and 20-23 were rejected, at paragraph 4 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bullman in view of Moon. Claim 3, 8-10, 16 and 20 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering the rejection of these claims moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the remaining rejections.

Claims 4 and 7 depend from claim 1. The cited portions of Bullman and Moon fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of elements of claim 1. For example, as discussed above, the cited portions of Bullman and Moon fail to disclose or suggest initializing a finite state machine using first template state data, as in claim 1. Accordingly, claims 4 and 7, which depend from claim 1, are also allowable.

Additionally, the cited portions of Bullman and Moon fail to disclose initializing a first finite state machine defined by a first telecommunication protocol template using first template state data to arrive at a first template state, as in claim 14. Accordingly, claims 17 and 21-23, which depend from claim 14, are also allowable.

New Claims 44-55 are Allowable

New claims 44-51 depend from claim 1, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Accordingly, claims 44-51 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

New claims 52-55 depend from claim 14, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Accordingly, claims 52-55 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 14.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the cited portions of the references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.

Any changes to the claims in this response, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

12-5-2008
Date

Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Toler Law Group, Intellectual Properties
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)